



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

## Review of 1st Generation Participatory Budgeting in Scotland

**Citation for published version:**

Escobar, O, Harkins, C & Moore, K 2016, *Review of 1st Generation Participatory Budgeting in Scotland*. What Works Scotland.

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Review of 1<sup>st</sup> Generation Participatory Budgeting in Scotland

Chris Harkins, Katie Moore  
Glasgow Centre for Population Health  
Oliver Escobar  
What Works Scotland



## About the review

This review has been commissioned by What Works Scotland and was undertaken by Chris Harkins and Katie Moore at the Glasgow Centre for Population Health and Dr Oliver Escobar from What Works Scotland at The University of Edinburgh.

This review should be cited as:

**Harkins C, Moore K, and Escobar O. (2016) *Review of 1<sup>st</sup> Generation Participatory Budgeting in Scotland*. Edinburgh: What Works Scotland.**

## What Works Scotland

What Works Scotland (2014-2017) is a collaborative research programme between The Scottish Government, the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), the University of Edinburgh and the University of Glasgow.

What Works Scotland is working with Community Planning Partnerships and a range of public and third sector partners across the country to improve the use of evidence to make decisions about public service development and reform. For more information please see:

[www.whatworksscotland.ac.uk](http://www.whatworksscotland.ac.uk)

## About the review team

**Chris Harkins** is a Senior Public Health Research Specialist at the Glasgow Centre for Population Health and Honorary Researcher at the University of Glasgow.

Email: [christopher.harkins@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:christopher.harkins@glasgow.ac.uk)

**Katie Moore** is a Research Assistant at the Glasgow Centre for Population Health.

Email: [catriona.moore@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:catriona.moore@glasgow.ac.uk)

**Dr Oliver Escobar** is a Lecturer in Public Policy at the University of Edinburgh and Co-Director of What Works Scotland.

Email: [oliver.escobar@ed.ac.uk](mailto:oliver.escobar@ed.ac.uk)






## Executive Summary

### Introduction

Participatory Budgeting (PB) has the potential to empower and energise communities and to transform and strengthen the relationship between citizens, civil society organisations and all levels of government and public service. Scotland has recently embarked on its own PB journey, and the profile and spread of PB has markedly accelerated over the past five years; from little more than a handful of known PB processes in 2010, to at least 58 processes having taken place by 2016<sup>8</sup>. Alongside this grassroots growth of PB within Scotland's communities, there has also been increasing political, legislative and policy support for PB.

This paper presents a review of existing evidence about the PB processes that have taken place in Scotland up until June 2016. The review examines the growth and development of the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland in order to generate insight to support the strategic and operational leadership and delivery of future PB.

Figure 1: Overview of 1st Generation Participatory Budgeting in Scotland



Please note: all data presented in this info-graphic are estimates only, and based on incomplete information. Please see the Review Findings section of this report for details of missing data.

## Review Highlights

- At least £1.75 million has been invested across 58 PB processes in Scotland to date.
- Information about funding sources is available for 30 of the 58 cases. Of the 30, 23 PB processes were funded directly by the Scottish Government (77% of cases where funding source could be determined).
- Participatory budgets ranged from £750 to £200,000, the average expenditure being £28,400 per PB process. Smaller budgets were not necessarily indicative of lesser PB processes or diminished potential impacts for participants.
- At least 179 individual projects have been funded via PB, allocating on average £9,300 per project.
- Funded PB projects reflect an impressive mix of prioritised demographic groups and thematic issues as well as support for a range of geographically defined facilities, projects and local community representation groups (e.g. community councils).
- 57% of PB processes have taken place within the South West of Scotland including Glasgow City and surrounding Local Authority Areas.
- Only 7% of PB processes were located in rural areas (dwellings of less than 3,000 people).
- Where geographical information was available (30 cases), 90% of PB processes were located within disadvantaged areas (lowest quintile in the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation), yet only one fifth of PB processes stated the explicit goal of addressing inequalities.
- There is little evidence available of PB processes that feature substantial opportunities for public dialogue and deliberation between participants.
- There is a lack of information and evaluation across the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland, making accurate accounts of PB processes, and assessment of project impacts, very challenging.

## Review Recommendations

- The authenticity and vibrancy behind Scotland's 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB processes and projects must be recognised and should be celebrated.
- The national policy drive associated with the transition into 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland should not undermine what must become an enduring focus on local context involving PB approaches tailored to community contexts and priorities.
- The depth to which PB should be implemented across Scotland (i.e. from grant-making to mainstream budgets), and the impacts expected in tackling inequalities and improving public services, must remain central points in policy discussions in order to frame and clarify the scale and ambition of 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland.
- Rural areas appear underserved by the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB and attempts should be made to redress this within the emerging 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation.
- PB test-sites (e.g. involving mainstream budgets) should be established across different geographies and thematic priorities; these test-sites should be supported through robust



evaluation over time, the learning from which could be disseminated through a national PB network and inform future policy on PB.

- Opportunities for meaningful dialogue and robust deliberation between citizens, civil society organisations, elected representatives and public authorities should feature more prominently in the design and implementation of PB processes, and thus become a key component in the evaluation of the democratic quality of PB.
- There is little evidence of the use of digital engagement platforms to support PB processes, moving forward this is an area worth exploring and expanding within 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB.
- Evaluation within the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland should involve developing theories of change, including paying attention to impacts resulting from both PB processes and the resultant funded projects.
- Assessing the future success of PB in Scotland must entail examining what PB does for people and communities, as well as for the democratic system that binds them together.

## Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction .....	3
Review Highlights.....	4
Review Recommendations .....	4
Introduction .....	7
Participatory Budgeting: a global movement .....	7
Scotland's Participatory Budgeting journey.....	8
Participatory Budgeting in Scotland: an important juncture.....	10
Purpose, aims and structure of the review.....	12
Methodology and approach .....	13
Review Findings: Scotland's 1 <sup>st</sup> Generation of PB.....	14
Key Highlights.....	14
Geography.....	15
Funding .....	16
Processes and Projects.....	17
Impacts and Evaluation.....	19
Discussion.....	21
Recommendations .....	23
References .....	25
Appendix: List of 1 <sup>st</sup> Generation PB Processes.....	27

## Tables and Figures

Table 1: Key elements in Scotland's PB journey, transitioning from 1st to 2nd Generation PB .....	11
Figure 1: Overview of 1st Generation Participatory Budgeting in Scotland .....	3
Figure 2: Map of Scotland's 1st Generation of PB Processes, courtesy of PB Scotland via Google maps .....	15



## Introduction

### Participatory Budgeting: a global movement

Participatory Budgeting (PB) has the potential to empower and energise communities and to transform and strengthen the relationship between citizens, civil society organisations and all levels of government and public service. Since its inception in the late 1980s PB has gained international recognition for its potential for deepening democratic processes, and advancing social justice priorities, by involving communities in deciding how to spend public funds. At its core, PB is about allocating public money to support services and initiatives that matter to citizens. PB started in Brazil in the late 1980s and has now spread to in excess of 1,500 localities across the globe with around 2,700 PB processes taking place<sup>1,2</sup>.

PB originated as part of a rapid and far reaching democratic renewal of Brazilian society and as part of social movements to address inequalities. In the 1980s new democratic processes were established across Brazil after the demise of the country's military dictatorship<sup>3</sup>. Evaluations of the impacts of PB in Brazil have been convincing; documented improvements to services, infrastructure, governance and citizen participation directly as a result of PB processes<sup>4</sup> have been instrumental in achieving reductions in social and health inequalities<sup>5</sup>. By contrast, most European countries which have implemented PB (such as Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, Italy, and UK) have comparatively settled political contexts and long established democratic institutions. Accordingly, the outcomes of PB in Europe have not been as stark as those in Brazil where PB became 'mainstream' at various levels of government, public services and community life.

A 2014 review of PB in the UK concluded that there have been "concrete results, but limited impact"<sup>6</sup>. This means that the PB processes examined had yielded a range of important social benefits for the citizens involved (confidence, aspiration, empowerment, and increased sense of control, knowledge and awareness) but that the impacts of the PB projects had not yet translated into significant changes in outcomes for participants or communities or in terms of addressing inequalities. This is unsurprising given the somewhat curtailed level of resources allocated to British PB so far, in comparison to Brazilian PB. PB processes in the UK to date have tended to be on a small scale, involving community grant-making schemes, rather than mainstream budgets as seen in the Brazilian model<sup>7</sup>.



## Scotland's Participatory Budgeting journey

Scotland has recently embarked on its own PB journey and the profile and spread of PB has markedly accelerated over the past five years; from little more than a handful of known PB processes in 2010, to at least 58 processes having taken place by 2016<sup>8</sup>. Alongside this grassroots growth of PB within Scotland's communities, there has also been increasing political, legislative and policy support for PB.

The appeal of PB in Scotland's current political landscape is clear; recent political milestones such as the 2014 Scottish independence referendum, 2015 UK General Election and 2016 European Union 'Brexit' referendum (*the former hailing record levels of voter turnout and national engagement with politics in Scotland*<sup>9</sup>, *the results of the latter two being described as an undemocratic representation of Scotland's political views and majority vote to remain in the European Union*<sup>10</sup>) served to ignite issues of national identity and political sovereignty - vocalising a dissatisfaction with Westminster politics and current democratic structures. In the absence of a 'post-Brexit' social democratic consensus as to the way forward for Scotland, the increasing profile of PB is at the least symbolic of a national drive towards deepening democratic processes and increasing opportunities for Scottish citizens to democratically participate in local decision making.

The rise of PB's profile in Scotland does however pre-date these political milestones. In 2010 the Glasgow Centre for Population Health (GCPH) began an evaluation of a PB pilot in Glasgow, publishing the report in early 2012<sup>11</sup>. This paper was one of the first to make important links between PB and strategic and policy challenges within Scotland at the time, and which are still relevant now. The report made clear the role PB could have in mobilising citizens and community assets; promoting collaborative working and enabling devolved decision making and community empowerment. The GCPH recommended that 1% of public sector investment budgets be allocated to PB; this target being in line with the then PB Unit's (laterally PB Partners<sup>12</sup>) recommendation as a realistic step towards 'mainstreaming' PB without compromising statutory service delivery. As described later in this section this recommendation has now been endorsed by the Scottish Government. The report gained traction in part because its key messages resonated powerfully with the Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services 'Christie Commission', published just months before<sup>13</sup>.

In 2014, the Scottish Government set up a PB Working Group to consider a range of issues including capacity building and evidence on models of PB implementation. This group has coordinated Scottish Government funded national events and tailored local PB training within 20 Local Authority Areas and Community Planning Partnerships currently featuring PB processes<sup>14</sup>. The training programme, delivered by PB Partners (with assistance by the Democratic Society for digital participation), is currently in its final stages, and a number of resources have been developed to support PB organisers. See for example the new *PB grant making 'how to' guide*:

<http://pbscotland.scot/blog/2016/10/5/new-pb-grant-making-how-to-guide-available>.

Along the way, support for PB has emerged from a range of public sector and civil society organisations. The Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) endorsed the findings from the 2014 Commission on Strengthening Local Democracy, which includes developing and supporting PB as a key recommendation to enable new forms of public participation<sup>15</sup>.



Similar support for PB has been expressed by civic organisations such as the Electoral Reform Society Scotland<sup>17</sup>, the Reid Foundation's Commission on Fair Access to Political influence<sup>18</sup>, and Oxfam and the Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations<sup>19</sup> over the past five or more years.

There have also been new research projects on PB. What Works Scotland (WWS) was established in 2014 as a large multi-partner and cross-sectorial research and knowledge exchange program funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and the Scottish Government<sup>16</sup>. Its purpose is to improve the way evidence is used to improve public services. One strand of WWS's programme is dedicated to generating evidence on PB. WWS has also been working alongside public and third sector partners to develop capacity for PB across the country. In 2015 WWS collaborated with the GCPH in producing an overview of PB strategic design choices and principles for effective delivery tailored to the Scottish context (Available here: <http://whatworksscotland.ac.uk/launch-of-participatory-budgeting-scotland-report-by-gcph-wws>)

In 2015, the Scottish Parliament passed the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015, which affords communities and citizens new rights to participate in policy and decision making. The Act includes a new 'regulation-making power' (Section 10) which gives ministers the capacity to require Scottish public authorities to promote and facilitate the participation of citizens in the decisions of the authority, including the allocation of resources.

More recently, the Minister for Local Government and Housing, Kevin Stewart MP, reiterated the Scottish Government's commitment to PB made in the 2016 SNP electoral manifesto:

*I want us to be ambitious in what we do which is why we are committed to ensuring local authorities have a target of giving at least 1% of their budget to Community Choices. This amounts to tens of millions of pounds which will be in the hands of local people to decide how best to spend that money in their communities, on their priorities.* (July 2016, see: <http://pbscotland.scot/blog/2016/7/22/a-message-from-the-minister>)

References to PB are becoming a staple of political party manifestos in Scotland. The most recent and significant example is the Glasgow SNP's manifesto, which includes a commitment of £100 million for PB in their bid to take over Glasgow City Council in 2017 (see <http://thirdforcenews.org.uk/tfn-news/100m-for-the-citizens-of-glasgow-to-spend-how-they-chose>).

In sum, recent political, governmental and legislative developments have launched PB into the mainstream of Scottish policy and politics. This marks a turning point towards what this report calls 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland.

## Participatory Budgeting in Scotland: an important juncture

The momentum illustrated in the previous section was crystallised in the Scottish Government's Programme for Scotland 2015-16 (announced by Nicola Sturgeon, First Minister, in September 2015) which formally articulated a strong governmental commitment to PB. Over 2015-16, the Scottish Government has funded a range of PB support and training for local authorities, and research on the impacts of PB on communities<sup>20</sup>. This has been followed by a budget of £530,000 in January 2016, with a further £1.5 million awarded in October 2016, to support PB processes nationally as part of the Community Choices Fund<sup>21</sup>.

In combination these recent developments set out an unprecedented policy, legislative and investment framework from which to further embed PB across Scotland. This represents an important juncture from which to consider the processes that have taken place to date and the future journey of PB. For the purpose of this paper, PB processes developed before June 2016 will be referred to as '1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB', whilst future PB processes will be referred to as '2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB' –with the Community Choices Fund representing the transition milestone.

1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB in Scotland has been often supported by the Scottish Government and several local authorities and third sector partners, but can be broadly characterised as organic and grassroots. That is, the majority of early PB processes in Scotland appear to have emerged where there have been local champions, appropriate support and opportunities and the process has fitted well with specific funding schemes, local plans and community priorities and concerns. Reflecting on 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB is timely and useful in assessing Scotland's PB experience with a view to contextualising and informing the development of 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB.

Learning from 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB in Scotland flags up important strategic and implementation challenges and considerations for moving forward. This is especially important as the route that 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland may take points towards a mainstreaming model (i.e. citizen participation in the allocation of portions of mainstream public budgets), although this remains to be clarified in policy terms. Importantly, the organic nature of 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB is not a weakness in current policy or planning, rather it is indicative of a very encouraging PB journey which appears to value grassroots learning and insights; a journey that is not top-down, does not impose restrictive conditionality or prescriptive processes. Rather this experience suggests that PB is at its strongest when processes are bespoke and tailored; recognising and adapting to community contexts, priorities and aspirations. Prominent PB commentators Ganuza and Baiocchi have discussed and framed the type of PB juncture that Scotland appears to be at; from grassroots development to potential mainstreaming in terms of a peripheral 'policy device' transitioning into an embedded 'policy instrument'<sup>22</sup>.

Table 1 summarises the above descriptions of 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB as well and outlines what 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB that appears to be moving towards mainstreaming may entail. Important questions facing the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation of PB are highlighted in bold. The table also draws on material presented in the 2015 joint GCPH, WWS publication: 'Participatory budgeting in Scotland: an overview of strategic design choices and principles for effective delivery'<sup>23</sup>:



Table 1: Key elements in Scotland's PB journey, transitioning from 1st to 2nd Generation PB

Scotland's PB journey	1 <sup>st</sup> Generation PB	2 <sup>nd</sup> Generation PB
<b>Timeline</b>	58 PB processes up to June 2016	Beginning in 2016-17 with the Community Choices Fund and the start of the implementation phase of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act
<b>Characteristics</b>	Grassroots development of PB, predominantly small scale, community grant-making. Driven by local champions, appropriate support and opportunities. PB processes have fitted well with specific funding structures, local plans and community priorities and concerns.	Unprecedented policy, legislative, capacity building and investment framework from which to further embed PB across Scotland.  <b>Key question:</b> <b>Is Scotland transitioning into mainstream PB, where citizens can participate in the allocation of mainstream budgets?</b>
<b>Status</b>	Rapid acceleration in PB recognition and value over past 5 years but still peripheral within the political and policy landscape and public service delivery structures.	The status of PB in Scotland has never been higher. PB has been elevated from a peripheral grassroots process and device to a national policy arena and instrument. PB processes appear to be more accepted and potential impacts receive more scrutiny.  Visible commitment from Scottish Government and increasing profile within local authorities, third sector and community groups.  <b>Key question:</b> <b>Will PB be embedded in the democratic process to make decisions about public services in Scotland?</b>
<b>Policy device or instrument</b>	PB as a peripheral policy device.  PB used as a symbolic and technical process of community engagement which does not necessitate substantial changes to the way in which political actors, civil society, and the state interact.  PB as a policy device is concerned with community engagement and representation in the allocation of short-term small amounts of funding or grants.	Mainstreaming PB involves reorienting the relationship between political actors, civil society, and the state. This entails PB becoming a key policy instrument used to improve decision making and tackle inequalities.  PB in this form is a new way of governing and entails fundamental changes to the structures and processes of public administrations. PB as a policy instrument is written into the DNA of all levels of government, public service delivery and community life.  <b>Key question:</b> <b>Is PB in Scotland evolving into a national and local policy instrument to improve democracy and social justice?</b>
<b>Impacts on inequalities</b>	Strong and positive 1 <sup>st</sup> Generation PB projects have been funded in Scotland.  Most impacts relate to the social benefits for the citizens involved as a result of engaging in the PB process, e.g.: improved confidence, aspiration, empowerment, increased sense of control, knowledge and awareness.	PB as a policy instrument requires significant resources, scale and stability, e.g.: committing a proportion of public sector budgets to PB, redefining governance structures and re-orienting the relationship between politicians, communities and public services.  Effective delivery of this form of PB may be more in line with the Brazilian social movement ideology of social justice and the redistribution of power and resources.  PB as a policy instrument is predicated on addressing social inequalities and enhancing conditions and outcomes for disadvantaged communities and citizens. Impacts should stem from the PB process in the short-term as well as longer-term impacts to life course outcomes.  <b>Key question:</b> <b>If PB in Scotland develops into a policy instrument, will it be for the purpose of addressing social inequalities?</b>

## **Purpose, aims and structure of the review**

This paper reviews the PB processes that have taken place in Scotland up until June 2016. The review examines the growth and development of the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland in order to generate insight to support the strategic and operational leadership and delivery of future PB. The purpose of this paper is to inform the development of policy which recognises the transition from 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland, identifying key decisions which must be considered at this juncture. This paper may also be useful to PB organisers, communities and citizens involved in PB processes.

The review is structured as follows. First, we have introduced PB as a global movement, describing its Latin American roots and touching upon its spread across Europe and impacts within the UK. Next, Scotland's PB journey was outlined including the rapid growth in PB processes across the country; PB's relevance to Scotland's political landscape; and important milestones and developments which have contributed to the recent policy, legislative and investment framework for PB in Scotland. Next we described the current juncture in Scotland's PB journey and how, for the purposes of this review, PB processes up until June 2016 are described as 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB, whilst future PB in Scotland is referred to as 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB. Table 1 summarised some key insights into this juncture and the transition into 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB.

Next the Methods section details the approach taken in accessing and analysing information across the 58 PB projects. This is followed by a short findings section and a discussion of key points from the review, framed in terms of their implications for Scotland's continuing journey with PB. The paper concludes with some recommendations which aim to support the strategic and operational development of 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland.



## Methodology and approach

The central methodology used in this review is an analysis of web-based information relating to Scotland's 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB processes. In the first instance information on the PB Scotland website<sup>24</sup> was reviewed for a total of 58 processes. PB Scotland has been developed by the Scottish Community Development Centre with funding from the Scottish Government. PB Scotland's website acts as a hub for sharing and learning about PB initiatives around Scotland and has basic profile information on the 58 PB processes, with web links to further information available for some of the projects.

A spreadsheet template was developed based on several sweeps of the information available within the PB Scotland website. This template was used to develop a database including the following information about each PB process:

- name;
- location, socioeconomic characteristics and location category (based on the Scottish Government 2 fold Urban/Rural Classification<sup>24</sup>);
- budget (in £s);
- organisation(s) leading the PB process;
- organisation(s) funding the PB process;
- demographics of the population involved;
- details of the process;
- implementation date and timeline;
- evaluation of the process;
- and assessment of the projects funded.

Where web-based information was incomplete internet searches were undertaken on individual PB processes in an effort to ensure as complete a dataset as possible. Additionally, a range of PB process reports and documents were reviewed some of which were obtained from the Scottish Government PB Working Group; others were received via correspondence with organisers of PB processes. It was beyond the scope of this review to contact or track down all individual PB processes and funded projects to glean missing data.

Where textual descriptors of PB processes and impacts exist, these have been examined using qualitative thematic analysis. Thematic analysis involved coding specifically PB process and impacts descriptors and evaluations into categories that summarise and systemise the content of the information. In this instance categories were derived from the information (rather than the prior theoretical framework). The advantage of this approach in this context is that the analysis provides a useful summary of PB experiences and emergent themes identified as important as well as an overview of the range and diversity of the PB processes and ideas presented. The quality of the analysis was monitored through the collaboration of the review team (including the 3 authors of this report) throughout the process. It must be noted that the pace of PB development across the country is fast and documentation about PB processes is not always publicly available. A key limitation of this review is its reliance on the PB Scotland database and thus omissions are likely.

## Review Findings: Scotland's 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB

### Key Highlights

- At least £1.75 million has been invested across 58 PB processes in Scotland to date.
- Information about funding sources is available for 30 of the 58 cases. Of the 30, 23 PB processes were funded directly by the Scottish Government (77% of cases where funding source could be determined).
- Participatory budgets ranged from £750 to £200,000, the average expenditure being £28,400 per PB process. Smaller budgets were not necessarily indicative of lesser PB processes or diminished potential impacts for participants.
- At least 179 individual projects have been funded via PB, allocating on average £9,300 per project.
- Funded PB projects reflect an impressive mix of prioritised demographic groups and thematic issues as well as support for a range of geographically defined facilities, projects and local community representation groups (e.g. community councils).
- 57% of PB processes have taken place within the South West of Scotland including Glasgow City and surrounding Local Authority Areas.
- Only 7% of PB processes were located in rural areas (dwellings of less than 3,000 people).
- Where geographical information was available (30 cases), 90% of PB processes were located within disadvantaged areas (lowest quintile in the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation), yet only one fifth of PB processes stated the explicit goal of addressing inequalities.
- There is little evidence available of PB processes that feature substantial opportunities for public dialogue and deliberation between participants.
- There is a lack of information and evaluation across the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland, making accurate accounts of PB processes, and assessment of project impacts, very challenging.






## Geography

The map below is extracted from the PB Scotland website<sup>24</sup> and shows the geographic spread of the 58 PB processes (denoted by green markers) implemented across Scotland:

Figure 2: Map of Scotland's 1st Generation of PB Processes, courtesy of PB Scotland via Google maps





33 of the 58 PB processes (57%) have taken place within the South West of Scotland including Glasgow City and surrounding Local Authority Areas. 22 PB processes have taken place within Glasgow City Local Authority Area (38% of Scotland's 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB processes), two have taken place within North Lanarkshire, two within South Lanarkshire and six within Ayrshire (10% of Scotland's 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB processes); comprising one in North Ayrshire, three in South Ayrshire and two taking place in East Ayrshire. Moving Eastward, Edinburgh City has undertaken five PB processes (9% of Scotland's PB processes to date), with the Fife Local Authority Area hosting a further six. Stirling and Perth and Kinross having introduced one PB process each.

Moving North, the Highland Council area has hosted three processes to date. Aberdeenshire has developed two PB processes and Aberdeen City has hosted one. Moray has been home to two PB processes and Angus has introduced one. The Western Isles have hosted two and the Shetland Isles have developed three to date.

Interestingly, despite the apparent geographic spread of the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB processes, only 4 of the 58 (7% of total PB processes) could be described as taking place in a rural setting (settlements of less than 3,000 people<sup>25</sup>). Three cases did not have enough information to establish the location category, meaning that the remaining 51 PB processes (88% of the total PB processes) were classified as taking place in an urban location.

A lack of specific community level information made assessing the socioeconomic status of the geographic areas within which the PB processes took place very challenging. Of the 58 cases, 28 did not have enough information to assess properly; or the geography described covered mixed SIMD data-zones<sup>26</sup>; some being disadvantaged, some not. Of the remaining 30 PB processes which referred to specific local communities, 27 (90% of PB processes for which there was enough information) were located within the lowest SIMD quintile (lowest 20% of data-zones within the SIMD) and for the purpose of this review are considered to be disadvantaged. The remaining three PB processes were delivered within communities which are not disadvantaged. From the PB process and PB funded project information available, approximately just under one fifth articulated an aim of using PB to address inequalities.

### Funding

Information relating to the PB process budget was available for 55 of the 58 PB processes. A total of just under £1.75 million has been invested in these 55 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB processes. Funding ranged from £750 per PB process to £200,000. The average level of funding per PB process was just over £28,400. The 55 processes funded a total of 179 community projects, meaning an average of 3.3 community projects were funded per PB process; ranging from one project per PB process to over 50 projects in one particular case. The average level of funding for each individual PB community project was just under £9,300. It is important to note that these average figures are skewed by the significant difference between small and large PB processes, but they provide a baseline for comparison over forthcoming years.

Information concerning the PB funding organisation behind each PB process is available for 30 of the 58 cases (52%). Of the 30, 23 PB processes were funded directly by the Scottish Government (77% of cases where funding source could be determined). Of the remaining seven PB processes, two were joint Scottish Government and Local Authority funded; one was joint Scottish Government and



COSLA funded; one was joint Local Authority and Regeneration Trust funded; two were funded exclusively by Local Authorities; finally, one PB process was funded exclusively by a Regeneration Trust.

## Processes and Projects

An impressive range of projects have been funded and implemented through the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB processes. Both PB processes and projects have been diverse, reflecting the vibrancy and uniqueness of each community across Scotland. A theme emerging early in the analysis was how the resultant projects appear tailored to community contexts, priorities and aspirations. However, there is a considerable lack of information across the vast majority of PB processes relating to the exact nature of the process, i.e. community engagement methods, number and purpose of events or meetings, facilitation and voting mechanisms.

21 of the 58 PB processes took place through an expansive PB drive delivered through Glasgow City's Community Planning Partnership (CPP); one PB process occurring in each of the 21 Local Area Partnerships across the City. The processes began in March 2016, with PB Partners providing training and support for each of the Area Partnerships. The programme was delivered through one event in each of the Area Partnerships; officers from Partnership & Development in the City Council provided practical support and facilitation to Area Partnership members in organising and delivering each of the events. Each PB process had a budget of £10,000, a total of 217 funding applications were received, with just over 1,000 people participating in the process across the city and 119 projects funded, allocating just under £210,000. The PB processes appeared to adopt an aggregative approach<sup>22</sup>, where participants scored each proposal with marks out of 5. This aggregative model seeks to minimise the effect of participants only voting for projects proposed by groups or organisations they know; one out of six funded projects were new to Area Partnership funding.

The funded projects were varied reflecting a mix of prioritised demographic groups and thematic issues (including young people, elderly people, homeless people, education and training, health, equalities, tackling alcohol-related harm) as well as support for geographically defined facilities, projects and structural developments (such as community facilities, community councils, community gardens and foodbanks). A striking feature of the PB process taking place through Glasgow's CPP is the capacity building involved for community member participants and applicants and amongst professionals (predominantly Local Authority and CPP staff). Moving forward the Area Partnerships and participating community groups and community members should be in a stronger position to implement PB.

Of the remaining 37 PB processes, 10 (27%) were focussed on initiating new, and enhancing existing, community based support and services for young people. One focussed specifically on young people with disabilities. Useful community engagement and PB participation information was available for four of the 10 processes, among these four approximately 4,200 young people participated. These processes displayed elements of both aggregative and deliberative PB models<sup>22</sup>. Incorporating deliberative PB elements within the process was deemed especially important by two of the projects working with young people as the emphasis was on dialogue and deliberation regarding priorities, options and trade-offs. The young participants were able to learn about the issues and initiatives at stake and engage in dialogue and deliberation with other participants and project proposers; thereby 'setting the agenda' from which agreed projects were voted on and thus ensuring that the

decisions were based on an informed and considered process of collective reflection. The deliberative model used in these cases can make the PB process longer, which is a key consideration for PB organisers, but it also increases its democratic quality as it features more opportunities for learning and scrutiny than the purely aggregative model. These cases also illustrate the potential for digital participation in PB. Examples of web-based, electronic project proposal information-sharing (such as online video clips) and voting have shown noteworthy promise with young PB participants within three of the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB processes.

13 of the PB processes were categorised as supporting general local community priorities; funding a range of projects. Existing community groups were often utilised in the first instance to begin the PB process with attempts then made to widen engagement and access across communities. Importantly, four of the 13 PB processes described had a distinct goal of embedding the processes within local area plans or partnerships. In these instances, there was clear support for continuing PB beyond the initial processes. Where information is available on the 13 processes, there again appeared to be both aggregative and deliberative PB components; with eight of the projects having between three and five PB events, concluded by a voting event for participants to decide on the use of funds.

Funded projects were, as stated, hugely varied in terms of scale, resource and potential impacts. Within Glasgow's Southside £100,000 of Scottish Government funding was allocated through PB to reopening the iconic Govanhill Baths building. This has been one of the largest PB investment in Scotland to date. The closure of the Govanhill Baths in 2001 had arguably taken on great significance within the Govanhill community. The Govanhill Baths Community Trust had been active for over 10 years, campaigning for the Baths to be reopened. The Baths Trust argued that the closure of the Baths was symptomatic of an area in decline and a diverse community experiencing disempowerment and a disconnection from political processes.

The reopening of the Baths as a trusted and valued community resource has been symbolic of renewed community empowerment throughout Govanhill; the PB process was seen as democratic, just and hugely valued in terms of building stronger working relationships between the Baths Trust and a variety of public services. A range of art, health and wellbeing, and employability projects and social enterprises have subsequently been launched through the Baths building with the support of the Trust. The PB investment has served as an important foundation from which the Govanhill Baths Trust has become a sustainable community asset serving a community of approximately 15,000 people.

Smaller financial awards were not indicative of lesser PB processes or diminished potential impacts for participants within communities. Smaller PB awards tended to be used to support and enhance existing projects over shorter time periods with limited numbers of community members benefiting from the PB funded projects. The 'Prestwick and Villages Decides' PB initiative for example, had a total budget of £15,000, but proved to be a vibrant and energising PB process which supported an impressive range of community based projects. The PB funds were made available from the South Ayrshire Health and Social Care Partnership, the Scottish Government and South Ayrshire Council. The process involved already engaged, existing community groups pitching to an audience (aged 12 and over) of local people about their proposal and how it would benefit the community. After all the pitches were heard, the audience voted to fully fund 21 of the groups up to £750, with 4 runners-up



being awarded £155 each. This is another example of the predominance of aggregative, rather than deliberative approaches in 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB in Scotland.

Projects funded through 'Prestwick and Villages Decides' included *Lingo Flamingo* - a 10 week language project for care home residents living with Alzheimer's, their carer's, friends and family; *Little Voices Big Sound* is a choir which will use their PB award to buy essential new equipment; members of the *Kyle Stroke Group* will benefit from art, exercise, and relaxation classes; *The Way Forward* will run classes to help people living with depression; PB funds will be used for greater numbers of young people to take part in activities organised through the *Outdoor Learning Group*; while the *Food Train* group will work with older people to support healthy eating and social interaction.

The Prestwick PB initiative was one of three (out of the 58 processes) that articulated a specific goal of enhancing health and wellbeing through the PB funded projects. Two other PB processes (i.e. 'Canny wi' Cash') were specifically targeted towards people aged 60 years and over, with a view to funding a range of activities to promote social connections and active lifestyles in later life, specifically including projects that promote intergenerational interaction. Two other PB processes were focussed on improving community safety, one with a specific aim of reducing anti-social behaviour. Other individual PB processes have focussed on delivering projects aimed at supporting carers; providing services for individuals with additional support needs; minimising the detrimental effects of excessive alcohol consumption and drug use on a defined community; alleviating the effects of poverty and disadvantage; and providing effective transport service to improve service access within a rural setting.

This diversity of PB processes and resultant funded projects is a clear strength of the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland. This is important in reflecting the uniqueness of each of the communities involved, but also reflects the distinctiveness of the interrelationships and structures that play out within community contexts and through PB processes; involving public services, third sector organisations, existing and emergent community groups and individual citizens.

These factors make PB processes challenging to compare and assessment of both process and projects difficult to generalise. These include differences in the description and reporting of locality characteristics, community engagement and PB process details including the nature and quantity of meetings and events, and the type of decision making process. In particular, at times there has been a lack of basic project information in this regard, coupled with inconsistencies in the use of terminology across the PB processes and the complexity of local contexts, structures and relationships.

## Impacts and Evaluation

There is a lack of information and evaluation across the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland, which makes robust assessment of PB impacts practically impossible. The reporting of impacts faces similar challenges to those of describing processes and projects, namely; differences in the descriptions and as well as inconsistencies in the use of terminology and the complexity of local contexts, structures and relationships which play out through PB and influence potential impacts. 38 of the 58 cases provided accurate timeline information; 29 processes were initiated in 2016; two in 2015; two in 2014; one in 2013; three in 2010 and one in 2009. Thus the majority of PB processes are very recent,

making impact assessment difficult even if appropriate evaluations were in place. But this point also raises the broader question as to when PB impacts are likely to be observable and for whom.

The lack of impact reporting or evaluation is not regarded here as a weakness of the PB processes or projects per se; rather it reflects the generative, organic journey Scottish PB has been on. This review has been retrospectively planned on the basis that grassroots 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB in Scotland had reached a critical mass and is at an important juncture - no prior evaluation or monitoring framework was agreed with any of the PB processes at their inception. It is also worth noting that this review may not have captured some documented accounts of PB process and impacts because they have not been consistently collated nationally.

Only the allocation of PB funds within the Govanhill Equally Well test site can be regarded as independently evaluated (by the GCPH). The Community Wellbeing Champions Initiative did involve the PB Unit as an external organisation leading the evaluation, but the report was jointly published by the funders, the Scottish Government and COSLA as well as the PB Unit, somewhat blurring the lines of independence. The report does describe both PB process and funded project impacts but highlights the complexity of attributing the project impacts in question to the PB process amid the myriad of potential influences at a neighbourhood level.

The 2012 GCPH evaluation of PB in Govanhill reported impacts in terms of the PB process, i.e. enhancing community engagement, establishing a meaningful and reciprocal dialogue between community organisations and public services in the area, and so on. However, it does not attempt to assess the impacts of the funded projects, for example – did the reopening of the Govanhill Baths enhance community cohesion in the area? Have the projects delivered through the Baths building enhanced the wellbeing of participants? etc. These are methodologically complex evaluation questions, the evidence for which may unfold months or even years after the PB process was initiated.

The 21 PB processes implemented in Glasgow City in April 2016 have been reported within one publication by Glasgow City Council and the Scottish Government. The report contains helpful information regarding the PB process, the funds awarded and an overview of successful projects. The report details useful feedback from participants involved, but does not address potential impacts –although it does state that in-depth evaluation is under way to improve future PB processes.

One other PB process report refers to a range of evaluation outputs which are published by the Local Authority involved. However, the outputs are more characteristic of internal business documents detailing budgetary spends and providing primarily an overview of the PB process. Through the PB Scotland website a total of 14 PB processes have written blogs about their PB experiences, all providing a basic overview of the goals of the PB initiative, some detailing the PB process and intended impacts. Three other PB processes had web-based information or websites, one was detailed in a press article and one had a Facebook page; none of these articulated project or process impacts. Very little information was available for the remaining 15 PB processes.



## Discussion

A striking finding when assessing the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB processes in Scotland is their diversity, reflecting a genuine commitment to be tailored to the uniqueness of local community contexts in which they were implemented. This finding is in keeping with one of the key messages emerging from the 2015 joint GCPH / WWS overview of strategic design choices and principles for effective delivery of PB in Scotland. The paper emphasises that importing ‘off the shelf’ PB models was not recommended. Instead, focus should be on ‘translation and adaptation’ of the design choices and delivery principles, rather than on ‘transplantation’.

The development of the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland can be characterised as organic and grassroots –in the sense that it wasn’t the product of national policy, which is poised to have a stronger influence on 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB. This developmental, iterative and generative growth of PB in Scotland has proven particularly adept at embodying bespoke PB processes and projects driven by local people alongside services and facilitators, and fuelled by a genuine desire and energy to try this new way of working and explore the potential of grant-making via PB. The authenticity and vigour behind Scotland’s 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB processes and projects must be recognised and should be celebrated. The learning, skills and capacity that have been developed across a range of partners and communities through the 58 processes, represent a strong foundation from which the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation can be built.

The growth and development of Scotland’s 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB within communities has been supported by the Scottish Government and a range of local authorities, public services and third sector organisations, yet has been un-impinged by prescriptive policy, implementation frameworks or monitoring requirements. This ‘free space’ for development and the recognition of the growth of PB as ‘a journey’ has proven to be effective but has meant that the availability of information across many of the PB processes and projects has been patchy and inconsistent. Nonetheless, the information available has enabled a reasonable overview of the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB and some useful insights.

The present juncture of PB in Scotland reflects a transition into an unprecedented policy, legislative, capacity building and investment landscape from which to further develop and embed processes across the country. The status of PB in Scotland has never been higher. Reflecting on the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB spells out an important warning for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation of processes and projects. As PB becomes more ‘mainstreamed’, recognised and accepted, and potentially embedded within policy and practice, the tendency will be to connect PB policy makers, practitioners, processes and projects; to establish networks, share good practice and establish consistent terminology, communication, branding, data collection and monitoring arrangements at regional and national levels. These are reasonable steps, but they must protect the authenticity and vigour seen across Scotland’s 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB processes; and certainly should not undermine what must become an enduring focus on local context where processes are tailored and adapted to community priorities and aspirations.

A crucial finding of this review is that the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB processes in Scotland has been dominated by one particular type of PB, namely, community grant-making. However, current developments suggest that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation may also entail PB processes that enable citizen participation in decisions about mainstream budgets and public services (see ‘Mainstreaming PB:



Ideas for delivering Participatory Budgeting at scale', forthcoming publication in the PB Scotland website). If this comes to fruition, PB has the potential to rekindle local democracy on an unprecedented scale. But this will also require commitment by democratic innovators across the country in order to reinvent the relationship between citizens, public services and elected representatives. This may have implications for current arrangements in governance, procurement, budgeting and administration, which should be considered in the programme of local government reform that the Scottish Government has announced for the next few years.

The review also highlights the predominance of aggregative models of PB, where voting takes place without prior substantial dialogue and deliberation about issues, priorities, aspirations and trade-offs. In contrast, deliberative models can increase the democratic quality of the PB process by allowing exploration, discovery, learning and scrutiny, which in turn can produce more robust, informed and considered decision-making. When PB provides spaces for dialogue and deliberation between citizens, elected representatives, civil society actors and public authorities, it creates opportunities for collective reflection, innovation and action. Put differently, when citizens can discuss and learn about their communities before casting a ballot, their vote can become a fuller expression of their preferences and considered judgement. Deliberative quality is important regardless of the PB model, but arguably more so if the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation of PB is to include mainstream budgets and services. The review makes clear that the majority of processes and projects (for which there was available information) have taken place within disadvantaged areas. The review also suggests, however, that only a minority of 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB has been articulated as having the explicit goal of improving services, opportunities or conditions within disadvantaged areas and addressing inequalities. It may well be that the lack of information encountered in this review has skewed this finding and that a focus on inequalities is under-reported across the 58 cases.

The lack of a clear articulation of a focus on inequalities does however appear to be mirrored by the present transition between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland. As table 1 summarises and the findings of the review describe, the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of processes and projects can have an inequalities focus in terms of the use of PB as a policy device to engage disadvantaged communities in a local decision making process and to fund predominantly small scale, short-term projects. The main impacts of this type of PB are most likely to be related to increasing participants' confidence and social connections resulting from the PB process, as well some other immediate local benefits resulting from the funded projects. If the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland is 'mainstreamed' in a fashion similar to Brazil, and its application is as a policy instrument then this means a fundamental shift in the way public services are delivered. PB in this form means structural and governance change and redistribution of public resource to disadvantaged regions and communities alongside tailoring service delivery based on community priorities and contexts. The system wide application of PB as a policy instrument is long-term and is more likely to foster the reduction of social and health inequalities in terms of life-course outcomes for disadvantaged communities.

Comparing Scotland's current political landscape with that of post-dictatorship Brazil in the late 1980s is of course flawed. The societal conditions in Brazil at that time (involving low levels of social protection and a lack of basic services and infrastructure within disadvantaged areas) drove the full scale adoption of PB as a policy instrument. Within Scotland, although there is an undoubted appetite and support for PB there can never be the same urgency as there was in Brazil. Comparison



of these different political contexts serves to energise the discussion as to the depth to which PB is expected to be implemented across Scotland and the resultant impacts to inequalities that could be expected. These are central and important points in framing and clarifying the nature of 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland.

As PB moves forward (in whichever form it takes) it would be beneficial to have ongoing reflection and to embed quality evaluation. For instance, it may be useful to have a small and manageable amount of PB test-sites across different geographies and thematic priorities. This review suggests that rural areas have been under-served by PB in Scotland to date. These test-sites could be supported through robust evaluation, the learning from which could be disseminated through the national PB network (i.e. PB Scotland) and help to inform policy. Importantly, future PB evaluation should entail developing theories of change within each site, which would map out in detail effective PB processes and their impacts, as well as outline the intended timescales where outcomes could be assessed.

## Recommendations

- The authenticity and vibrancy behind Scotland's 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB processes and projects must be recognised and should be celebrated.
- The national policy drive associated with the transition into 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland should not undermine what must become an enduring focus on local context involving PB approaches tailored to community contexts and priorities.
- The depth to which PB should be implemented across Scotland (i.e. from grant-making to mainstream budgets), and the impacts expected in tackling inequalities and improving public services, must remain central points in policy discussions in order to frame and clarify the scale and ambition of 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB in Scotland.
- Rural areas appear underserved by the 1<sup>st</sup> Generation of PB and attempts should be made to redress this within the emerging 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation.
- PB test-sites (e.g. involving mainstream budgets) should be established across different geographies and thematic priorities; these test-sites should be supported through robust evaluation over time, the learning from which could be disseminated through a national PB network and inform future policy on PB.
- Opportunities for meaningful dialogue and robust deliberation between citizens, civil society organisations, elected representatives and public authorities should feature more prominently in the design and implementation of PB processes, and thus become a key component in the evaluation of the democratic quality of PB.
- There is little evidence of the use of digital engagement platforms to support PB processes, moving forward this is an area worth exploring and expanding within 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation PB.
- Evaluation within the 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation of PB in Scotland should involve developing theories of change, including paying attention to impacts resulting from both PB processes and the resultant funded projects and/or services.



- Assessing the future success of PB in Scotland must entail examining what PB does for people and communities, as well as for the democratic system that binds them together.



## References

1. Baiocchi G, Ganuza E. Participatory Budgeting as if emancipation mattered. *Politics and Society* 2014;42(1):29-50.
2. Allegretti G, Antunes S. The Lisbon Participatory Budget: Results and perspectives on an experience in slow but continuous transformation. *Field Actions Science Reports* 2014; Special Issue 11. Available at: <http://factsreports.revues.org/3363> (accessed November 2015)
3. Lewitt D. Porto Alegre's Budget Of, By, And For the People. *YES! Magazine, Positive Futures Network*; 2002. Available at: <http://www.yesmagazine.org/issues/what-would-democracy-look-like/562> (accessed November 2015)
4. Sintomer Y, Herzberg C, Röcke A, Allegretti G. Transnational Models of Citizen Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting. *Journal of Public Deliberation* 2012; 8:2:Article 9
5. Goncalves S. The effects of participatory budgeting on municipal expenditure and infant mortality in Brazil. *World Development* 2014;53:94-110.
6. Rocke A. Framing citizen participation: Participatory Budgeting in France, Germany and the United Kingdom. London: Palgrave; 2014
7. Baiocchi G. Militants and citizens. The politics of participatory democracy in Porto Alegre. Stanford: Stanford University Press; 2005.
8. PB Scotland. Map of Participatory Budgeting in Scotland. Available at: <https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1sVAnEJMJOz2uAyBYgHeU9nYhHmE> (accessed September 2016)
9. Scottish parliament. Scotland turnout - all elections 1997 - 2011. Available at: [http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/Electionresults/2011%20election/5\\_Turnout\\_Region.pdf](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/Electionresults/2011%20election/5_Turnout_Region.pdf) (accessed February 2015)
10. Riddoch L. Nicola Sturgeon needs to keep Scotland in the EU. But how? *The Guardian Online* Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jun/24/nicola-sturgeon-keep-scotland-eu-independence>
11. Harkins C, Egan J. The role of participatory budgeting in promoting localism and mobilising community assets. But where next for Participatory Budgeting in Scotland? Learning from the Govanhill Equally Well test site. Glasgow: GCPH; 2012
12. <https://pbpartners.org.uk/>
13. The Scottish Government. Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services. The Scottish Government; 2011. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/06/27154527/0> (Accessed October 2011)
14. This information was obtained via the PB Working Group. Available at: <http://www.communityscot.org.uk/features/participatory-budgeting> (accessed November 2015)

15. Commission on Strengthening Local Democracy. <http://www.localdemocracy.info/> (accessed November 2015).
16. <http://whatworksscotland.ac.uk/>
17. Electoral reform Society. Democracy Max. <http://www.electoralreform.org.uk/democracy-max/> (accessed November 2015)
18. Government by the People. The Jimmy Reid Foundation.  
<http://reidfoundation.org/portfolio/government-by-the-people/> (accessed November 2015)
19. Community Empowerment Bill. Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations.  
<http://www.scvo.org.uk/long-form-posts/community-empowermentbill/> (accessed November 2015)
20. Scottish Government. The Government's Programme for Scotland 2015-16. Edinburgh: Scottish Government; 2015. Available at: <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2015/09/7685/0> (accessed November 2015)
21. <http://news.scotland.gov.uk/News/-1-5m-for-Community-Choices-Fund-2c21.aspx>
22. Baiocchi G, Ganuza E. Participatory Budgeting as if emancipation mattered. *Politics and Society* 2014;42(1):29-50.
23. Harkins C, Escobar O. Participatory Budgeting in Scotland: An overview of strategic design choices and principles for effective delivery. Glasgow: GCPH, WWS; 2015.
24. [www.pbscotland.scot](http://www.pbscotland.scot)
25. <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/About/Methodology/UrbanRuralClassification>
26. <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/SIMD>



## Appendix: List of 1<sup>st</sup> Generation PB Processes


£eith Decides  
Aberdeenshire Alcohol and Drug Partnership  
Anderston / City - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Ayr North Decides  
Baillieston - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Calton - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Canal (Ruchill) - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Canny wi' Cash  
Canny Wi' Cash Moray  
Cardenden Community Development Forum  
Carers Voice, Carers Choice  
Coalfields Regeneration Trust 'Futures' events  
Drumchapel / Anniesland - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Community GAINS  
Dunblane Young People's Project  
East Centre - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Garscadden / Scoutstounhill - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Govan - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Govanhill Baths Community Trust  
Grant a Grand  
Greater Pollok - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Grow Your Group  
Hillhead - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Kilwinning £ Your Money, You Decide  
Kincardine Community Association  
Kirkcaldy Kanes  
Langside - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Linn - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Lochaber youth projects  
Maryhill / Kelvin - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Mauchline Matters  
Mayfield and Easthouses Community Chest  
Midlothian Council and Coalfields Regeneration Trust  
Money for Moray  
My Vote, My Community  
Newlands / Auldburn - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Non-statutory bus services in Uist and Barra  
North East - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
North Lanarkshire Partnership  
Northfield Total Place  
Over to YOUTH  
Particip8 Overton

Partick West - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Pollokshields - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Possilpark - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Prestwick and Villages Decides  
Richmond Fellowship  
Shettleston - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Southside Central - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Springburn - Glasgow Community Budgeting  
Troon Locality Decides!  
Valley Ventures  
Wi Wis Fir Wis  
Wir Community, Wir Choice  
YouChoose  
Your Budget, Your Choice  
Your Cash Your Caithness  
Youth small grants pot





**WHAT  
WORKS**  
SCOTLAND

A decorative graphic to the right of the text, consisting of three interlocking gears. The top gear is yellow, and the two gears below it are teal. They are arranged in a small cluster, with the yellow gear partially overlapping the teal ones.